

New York Tribune.

First to Last—The Truth—News—Editorials—Advertisements.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 23, 1915.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, 150 Nassau Street, New York. Entered as second-class matter, October 3, 1879, under post office No. 104, New York, New York. Postmaster: J. J. McLaughlin.

Subscription Rates—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York.
Daily and Sunday, 1 year, \$10.00; 6 months, \$6.00; 3 months, \$3.50.
Daily and Sunday, 1 year, \$12.00; 6 months, \$7.50; 3 months, \$4.50.
Daily only, 1 year, \$8.00; 6 months, \$5.00; 3 months, \$3.00.

Foreign Rates—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York.
Daily and Sunday, 1 year, \$15.00; 6 months, \$9.00; 3 months, \$5.00.
Daily and Sunday, 1 year, \$18.00; 6 months, \$10.50; 3 months, \$6.00.
Daily only, 1 year, \$12.00; 6 months, \$7.50; 3 months, \$4.50.

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Matter.

You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for if dissatisfaction results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape, no quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

Great Circle Statesmanship.

With this administration it seems to be a principle to avoid straight lines and to travel instead in spirals or circles. Here is the coal-tar dyestuff situation, for example. The war cut off the normal supply of dyestuffs used by American manufacturers, since Germany had practically a monopoly of their production. Necessity is the mother of invention. So Americans set out to produce the dyes which they had previously been content to purchase from Germany.

According to statements made to the Society of Chemical Industry in this city the other night by Dr. Edward Ewing Pratt, Chief of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce of Mr. Redfield's Commerce Department, the effort to create an American coal-tar dyestuff industry has been remarkably successful. We have the raw material, the markets, the technical skill and the capital to develop this new industry. "Our total production of coal-tar dyestuff material at the present moment," said Dr. Pratt, "is probably over three times the production prior to the European war. In July, 1914, we were saving a scant 10 per cent of the coke by-products by means of by-product recovery coke plants; to-day we are saving not less than 20 per cent."

There is only one obstacle to the domestication of the coal-tar dyestuff industry. That is the threat that at the close of the war the highly organized German trust will invade our market and kill off the American producer by underselling him. Some years ago a New York concern organized to manufacture coal-tar dyestuff was put out of business in just that way. Dr. Pratt and Mr. Redfield admit that there is danger of the new American industry being strangled. They admit also that to permit such a piece of industrial piracy would be a rank injustice to American capital now being invested in the manufacture of coal-tar dyestuffs. Our economic efficiency would be lowered if we had to go back to the old state of dependency on the German trust.

But how does the Commerce Department intend to protect the American producer from his grasping German rival? The straightforward, common sense method would be to put a protective duty on coal-tar dyestuffs. A duty would prevent the German trust from dumping goods here except at a prohibitive loss. So long as an adequate duty was maintained the domestic manufacturer would be guaranteed against a competition intended to be simply and solely destructive.

But because Mr. Redfield is opposed to the idea of protection through tariff duties he wants to put off the people whom he asks to invest their money in the new dyestuff industry with a promise to secure them against unfair competition in some other way. Needless to say, that way is unnecessarily circuitous and dubious. Instead of keeping dumped German dyestuffs out by a tariff duty, easily collected, Mr. Redfield wants to let the goods come in and then proceed, under the provisions of the Trade Commission law, against corporations or individuals who buy or sell such dumped goods.

If the government permits dumped foreign goods to enter it thereby lifts any moral or legal ban on the sale or purchase of such goods in our market. It would be absurd to try to penalize persons dealing in such goods on the ground of "unfairness" to domestic producers after the government, having complete control of importations, has declined to exclude them from entry. If the government itself sanctions the "unfairness" of dumping by non-interference at the source how can it logically prosecute corporations or persons who do not see any unfairness in buying supplies passed through the Custom House at what looks to them like a bargain?

Mr. Redfield wants to keep the door wide open to unfair foreign competition and then hunt up and punish the Americans to whom the dumpers are permitted to sell their products. That is like the householder who refuses to screen his house against mosquitoes, preferring to let the pests in and then kill them off individually.

It is this sort of statesmanship which is bringing the administration into general discredit with the business community. Mr. McAdoo wants to reinvigorate our merchant marine by first killing off all the merchant marine which we now have. Mr. Redfield wants to encourage a new industry by promising to prosecute those who buy the goods of its foreign competitors, instead of making it impossible for foreign competitors to get their goods into our market at cutthroat figures. It is all the same thing—walking through a maze, avoiding straight lines, travelling in blind circles. One sentence in a tariff act would establish here permanently an important industry, making the country stronger and more independent. Rather than write that sentence,

the administration would stake the success of a big economic venture on a grotesque effort to suspend the law of supply and demand by means of detective activities and moral suasion.

A Paradox Explained.

Doubtless the readers of the "Staats-Zeitung" demanded an explanation. There must be some among them whose reading is not confined strictly to the hybrid press, and it is easy to figure their amazement and indignation at such headlines as these: "Ridder Shocked at Cavell Case," "Execution a Blunder," Says Herman Ridder," "A Terrible Thing," Says Herman Ridder," etc. How was it possible to reconcile such sentiments with the established conviction that Germany and the Germans are in all important respects a glorious example to the world?

There has been a misunderstanding. As such at least it may be suffered to pass, since Herr Ridder on this occasion does not attribute the error to the machinations of the English or to the malice of a subsidized press. Moreover, the headlines were literally correct, for Herr Ridder really was shocked and does still think the execution a blunder. "If it had been for us," the evening edition of the "Staats-Zeitung" explains, "to say the last word, Edith Cavell would not have died at the hands of German soldiers." It remains, however, to make clear why the deed was so shocking a blunder. The reason is that "Edith Cavell spared would have been less harmful than Edith Cavell a martyr."

This ought to satisfy the most suspicious of Herr Ridder's readers that he is as loyal as ever. By killing Edith Cavell the Germans blundered inasmuch as they contrived "to give Germany's enemies the opportunity to elevate her to a Joan of Arc." Herr Ridder therefore holds that "wisdom demanded that she be spared." In a word, the Germans were too simple to see that it would have paid better to let her go. What he regards as "terrible" is that they chose the course most harmful to themselves. It is a question not of humanity but of prudence and worldly wisdom.

Incidentally, the readers of the "Staats-Zeitung" are reminded that Joan herself was killed by "the brave British." And so in spite of their latest blunder the Germans can still boast that they are as civilized and humane as the English were five hundred years ago.

Scrap the Big Board!

Nothing could more plainly show the need for a small education board than the difficulties which led Mayor Mitchell to challenge its members to deliver wholesale resignations. Despite the enormous sums spent on the school system, its finances are in such condition as would bring any business institution into the bankruptcy courts. It isn't doing the work it should do—witness the part-time problem—and to do even what it does it has to rob Peter to pay Paul, and to borrow or beg extra revenues. Nobody thinks the money is improperly spent, but there are thousands, from educational experts to plain taxpayers, who believe the money, or a considerable part of it, is unwisely and unproductively spent.

It is not to be expected that a board of forty-six members could produce much better conditions than the present. No body of that size is capable of taking prompt, decisive action, even in a crisis, unless such action be the upholding of a time-honored—and probably mossbacked and outgrown—tradition. Whether it be a case of financial or educational policy, the big board, slow moving and unwieldy, may be expected to hesitate and quibble. There are able men in the big board, and others less able. The able men can never hope to leaven the mass. The city may never expect to have its school affairs administered to best advantage until it scraps the big Board of Education.

Baseball and Bullfights.

Perhaps one should not take too seriously the announcement of Mr. Carrillo, Carranza's consular agent at Los Angeles, that the First Chief will seek to substitute baseball for bullfights among his countrymen along the border. General Carranza is not aiming at present so much to reform as to subdue these countrymen, and no doubt, having once subdued them—if he is successful—he will postpone their uplift in the interests of peace.

But the announcement contains some suggestive comparisons and possibilities, none the less, which should not go unnoticed. To begin with, is baseball so lacking in bloodthirstiness that it may be considered a wholesome substitute for bullfights? The familiar cry of the fan, "Kill the umpire!" will come to mind to give one pause in replying to this question. No devotee of the bull ring ever pleaded more greedily and insistently for the gore of the noble beast charging the torador in his frenzy than have home team rooters for the life blood of the umpire. And the bull is merely an animal such as we ourselves consign to the slaughter house, while the umpire is always counted, at least in his unofficial moments, a human being. Would it not indeed be a positive detriment to Mexican morale to substitute a man for a beast as the object of carnal fury?

And let us consider the proposal, too, from the point of view of the prospective umpire. In this country, though his life may be in jeopardy, yet baseball audiences have become accustomed to being cheated of their victim. They scream for his blood, but with the subconscious conviction that their request will be in vain. At a bullfight, however, the Mexicans have full confidence in the success of their plea. And if the blood doesn't flow from the bull then it flows from the box office. They are well used to full satisfaction in this respect, and the mere substitution of umpire for bull will hardly change their long-established habit of mind overnight. When Mexican fans begin yelling "Kill

the umpire!" it should be fully realized that they will mean what they say.

For the sake both of Mexicans and umpires, therefore, we should advise the First Chief of the revolution to go slow in seeking thus to alter the cultural life of his country, if, indeed, he has the change in mind at all. The throes of the dying bull may, after all, be the safest outlet for the passions of which the Mexican temperament is capable.

High School "Frats" and Boy Scouts.

Parents should indeed prick up their ears when so wholly admirable and wholesome an organization as the Boy Scouts records its "unequivocal and unalterable disapproval" of high school fraternities. Such is its verdict in that eminently articulate community, Montclair. One of the leaders of the Boy Scouts in the New Jersey town has said: "I do not know of a single case where a scout has joined a 'frat' without deteriorating. In most cases the drop is most serious."

There is an unmistakable impression abroad that the influence of high school fraternities is distinctly demoralizing, as demoralizing in its way as that of the "gang," and nothing so far has confirmed it so eloquently as this condemnation from the Boy Scouts. Every one who has had any knowledge or experience of the latter organization knows that its influence, on the other hand, has been completely stimulating, like a blessed increase of oxygen to the growing generation, developing clean, honorable, self-reliant and capable men while supplying everything that a boy's heart could desire in the way of comradeship and adventure. It constitutes, in fact, an ideal with which to test the character of all other boys' organizations. The high school fraternity has evidently failed to pass the test. It has really no more excuse for existence, then, than the "gang" and must yield, as the other is yielding, to the prophylactic progress of the scout movement.

To Help the War Horses.

Even in these days, when men are surfeited with tales of human suffering, the following appeal should not be in vain:

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: The Blue Cross Fund needs money to carry on its work of humanity. The French government has given its official patronage to the scheme and a private subscription list has been opened in Paris, but no state grant has been made.

The recent days of cold weather have brought larger demands than last year for rugs, and arrangements are being made by the Blue Cross Fund to supply these. Every possible help is being rendered by the fund to mitigate the sufferings of war horses during the winter.

Subscriptions should be addressed to Mr. Arthur J. Cooke, secretary, 58 Victoria Street, Westminster, London, C. P.
London, England, Oct. 8, 1915.

The Blue Cross Fund was established three years ago by Our Dumb Friends' League for the purpose of alleviating the sufferings of the horses in the Balkan war. When the present war broke out the promoters of the scheme resolved to give what help they could and proffered their services to the British War Office. The authorities seemed to be satisfied that the veterinary arrangements already made were sufficient; at any rate, the league received but little encouragement from that quarter, and accordingly turned to the French government. They were more fortunate on this occasion, for leave was given them at once to establish eight hospitals for war horses.

In a very short time four such hospitals had been built and equipped. All of these have a permanent staff of veterinary surgeons and attendants in the proportion of one for every seven horses. The hospitals are all in the neighborhood of the fighting lines, and wounded horses are sought for and taken in for shelter and treatment. Those that are hopelessly wounded are killed, instead of being left to die miserably in the field; the rest receive appropriate care under the direction of expert veterinarians.

If this merciful work is to be carried on successfully it can only be by private help, for it is on popular subscription that the fund depends. Surely such a charity is deserving of support.

Hungry Bears Miss Lunch.—Headline, This, strangely enough, is not a tale of Wall Street but of Hudson Bay.

The "new Ford process of producing iron" obviously does not also produce blood and iron.

Better a cold parade, say the suffrage hosts, than a frost at the polls.

Cause for Thanksgiving?

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: The President, in his Proclamation of Thanksgiving, says, among other things: "Out of darkness and perplexities have come clearer conceptions of policy and clearer perceptions of the essential welfare of the nation."

Does he refer here to his policy of watchful waiting while the Mexicans are killing our citizens and destroying their property? Or does he refer to his policy of timid inactivity while the Germans were drowning our citizens and he was coddling Bernstein?

In the last year we have seen Mexico and Germany killing our people and the administration doing nothing but emit well-rounded phrases. Is it for this we should give thanks?

The wonder is that the President has not heard thundering in his ears, from every quarter of the country, a demand for virile action so loud and so determined that he would have been forced to do something.

But we are safe and a nation of shopkeepers; we have forgotten our obligations to France, and we have determined we owe none to humanity.

Is it for this we should give thanks?
LIVINGSTON RUTHERFORD.
New York, Oct. 21, 1915.

Not at Night.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: It is possible for me to take out my final citizen's papers at the night court? Will you kindly let me know through your paper what night the court sits?

New York, Oct. 14, 1915. G. FAY.

[The County Clerk's office no longer holds night sessions for naturalization. It will be necessary to attend the court during the day to get final papers.—Ed.]

"THE SHAM"

The British Ministry Defended from the Charge of Slackness.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: It appears to be correct form for correspondents to introduce themselves with a confession of faith. I might say that when I first arrived in America, some twenty-five years ago, I made a study of the New York daily papers and selected The Tribune. I have never changed, and I have never regretted my selection. It is inevitable that the views of readers cannot always fall in with any one paper. Any man who cannot occasionally fall out with his newspaper and go on reading it must be very narrow. I do not agree with your conclusions as to the motives of the President in his dealings with Germany, and I do not agree with the manner in which you make use of conditions in Great Britain and of the inevitable shortcomings of its democratic government for the purpose of stirring up this nation.

Your editorial, "The Sham," is certainly a masterpiece—a masterpiece in the way of twisting evidence for presentation to the jury. Recent articles of yours have claimed, or shall we say proved, that the President was influenced by political considerations in his dealings with Germany. Are we to believe that editors are equally human, and that they, likewise, are influenced by political considerations in dealing editorially with current conditions?

To any newspaper reader, aware of the main facts, your article, from first to last, discloses its intent and purpose. By a straining of facts you endeavor to point a moral for the benefit of this country and to promote attack on the policy of its government. Surely you have grounds enough for the desired attack and for criticisms of the British Ministry without discounting the value of your arguments by your manner of referring to the facts and conditions. Without going item by item through your points, we may take the main question of the preparedness of Great Britain. This has been worn threadbare, and I am surprised at your taking the stand you now do. For such share in defence, in the event of a European conflagration, as was foreseen when the two great military nations, France and Russia, entered into the understanding with the naval power, Great Britain, the government of Great Britain was fully prepared to the last detail. I think that I could refute from your own columns the suggestion that chance alone led to the mobilization of the British fleet. That fleet has accomplished its full purpose to a degree almost unbelievable, and, certainly, not foreseen. Mistakes have been made in some respects, but the fact remains that the German flag has been swept from the waters, and all of the Allies are at present reaping the full benefits from this.

As to the army, is there any evidence in view indicating that the Allies, France and Russia, ever suggested or expected the creation of a large army in England? I hold no brief for the present and recent British military. So far as I have retained any military feelings in regard to politics in the old country, they are distinctly against the party represented by the government in power at the outbreak of the war. Nobody can feel greater respect for the late Lord Roberts than those of British birth who have settled under other flags, but one must not forget that he was, professionally, a military man, and his teachings, leading England away from absolute and final reliance on her first line of defence, were teachings of weakness. Events have proved that her first line of defence was all it should have been, and events have proved that the territorial army, of which Lord Roberts once spoke very slightly in the House of Lords, is and has been of great value in building up the new armies. Whatever criticisms may be made of Lord Haldane, one must always remember, to his credit, that this territorial army existed as a result of his labors. My contention is that, so far as Great Britain was expected to contribute to the defence of Europe, she was prepared, and measured up to all fair and reasonable expectations.

BRITISH BIRTH.
New York, Oct. 22, 1915.

A Little Logic.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: Your editorial on the situation in England is very timely. Also, it is based on facts. That the government of England has lied to the people ever since the beginning of the war cannot be denied, and you do well to call attention to it. This being true, don't you think it is fair to assume that the English government also lied about its enemies, and that most of the stories of German atrocities must be taken with a large pinch of salt? The Tribune is not guilty, either. From the very beginning of the war it has consistently misinformed its readers as to actual conditions in Europe. The untruths with which the English government deceived its people found a ready echo in your columns. Are you willing to confess it?

BENEDICT PRIETH.
Newark, N. J., Oct. 22, 1915.

Congratulations.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: Congratulations for your "Sham." It is a piece of American patriotism seldom equalled, and for the English a testimony of the proverb, "Qui aime bien châtie bien."

HENRI DE LAFITOLE.
New York, Oct. 21, 1915.

Anton Lang Not a Soldier.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: I was a little interested and amused to read in this morning's Tribune an account from Manitowoc, Wis., containing notice of the death in battle of my father's cousin, Anton Lang, of Oberammergau. I say "amused," as I have positive information that Anton Lang, owing to ill health, is incapable of military service in any capacity.

Moreover, how Alois Lang, whom I know quite as positively to be serving actively with the Bavarian troops, could at the same time receive letters in the backwoods of Wisconsin is a puzzle.

I suspect strongly that you have been victimized by some one whose peculiar aptitudes would seem to disqualify him for intercourse, family or other, with participants in the great "Play of the Passion."

OTTO W. LANG.
New York, Oct. 22, 1915.

Gen. Moritz Ferdinand von Bissing.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: Can you not ascertain the name of the military governor, the military beast, who was responsible for the death of Miss Cavell? He should not be allowed to hide behind such a screen, but his name should be known and linked with Nero and Tiberius; and, furthermore, we wish to keep watch and see whether he survives this war. Such a coward will always avoid the dangers of battle. Yet we should like to know his fate.

WILLIAM K. N. BROWN.
Delaware City, Del., Oct. 22, 1915.

"EVERY KNOCK IS A BOOST."



THE WISE SCHOOLMASTER AND THE EASY PUPILS

A Fable with a Very Pointed Application to Present Conditions.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Once upon a time a very highly cultivated schoolmaster presided over one of our largest schools. He did not own the school for the pupils; they were only entrusted for a time to his charge. And so his responsibility was great. Of all the buildings in the town this school was by far the most inflammable and the least provided with fire fighting apparatus. The first schoolmaster (who had been a surveyor and then a soldier before he took charge of the school many years ago) earned his pupils that they should look to this, but his warning had been forgotten.

Indeed, the present schoolmaster had allowed what little fire hose there was in the building to rot away and the fire extinguishers to remain unfilled. Some said he was not entirely to blame, as the assistants he had chosen were quite ignorant of their duties, they needed money for other things, and so the bills which the school owed grew bigger and bigger and the money it had to pay them with grew less and less.

One day a dreadful fire broke out near the Belgian quarter of the town, started by some of the lower elements of humanity, who hoped that in the distress and confusion which would ensue they would be able to steal some of their neighbors' property, as they had done before. Two or three of them had gotten into the school, and they may be sure there wasn't much that they did not see. One was caught with some kerosene and a box of matches and sent home in disgrace, and another played hooky because he believed he had gotten into an idiot asylum at least, that is what he wrote home to his folks.

The fire spread and spread, and, carried by the wind, broke out in most unexpected places. When sparks began falling on the roof of the school a few of the pupils—Phil Platts, Bobby Burg and others—stayed up after hours, although they were tired out with their work, and tried to get up a fire drill as an example to the others, but they had nothing to work with. Some of the more timid pupils became frightened and asked the schoolmaster to provide them with protection, but he sternly forbade them even to think of such a thing.

In order to take their minds off the feared danger his assistant teachers provided a series of vaudeville performances and comic recitations to amuse the pupils. One funny fellow, who was quite ignorant of every thing except making tin motor cars, had never seen or heard of fire extinguishers, but he was quite ready to give his opinion about them, which he did in a loud voice.

He said they were nasty things and he was going to spend a lot of money to have them kept out of the school. And even then when those among the pupils who had no sense of humor were still afraid, the schoolmaster was quite patient with them and explained that some buildings are too proud to burn.

W. SCOTT CAMERON.
Southampton, Long Island, Oct. 19, 1915.

"A Real Neutral."

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: May I say a few words with regard to the letter of your correspondent J. A. E., who occupies the unique position of being a "real" neutral. To my mind, no man, or woman, in possession of his normal senses can be a real neutral unless he is totally and helplessly ignorant, and also criminally indifferent to the welfare of the world at large in relation to liberty and humanity. Does he ever think that the Allies are fighting not only for the liberty of their own nations and civilization but for his liberty also? I am certain that if England and her Allies are thrown to the ground in this fearful struggle, and Germany, with her Kultur and militarism, is in the world dominant, it is probable that the Emperor of Europe will rest content with a powerful and highly civilized nation like America to be forever a menace to his methods of barbarism and inhumanity.

England, I suppose, like every other nation, has her faults, but can any one deny that wherever the British flag has flown it has been the protector of the oppressed and the friend of humanity and the right?

Let us trust that this terrible nightmare

will terminate in a complete victory for the Allies, and I am sure that not only will every nation get what is right and just, but the ethics of Christianity and civilization will be preserved against the horror of militarism and tyranny. With many thanks for your wise and farseeing editorials, and warmest appreciation of your paper in general.
C. E. S.
New York, Oct. 21, 1915.

A Taxpayer's Protest.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: Whatever may be the programme for national defence submitted by the President and whatever the amount to be expended, whether millions or billions, it will be worse than useless under present conditions. These conditions are, briefly, that the millions spent on a battleship do not make it serviceable either for war or for defence. They merely convert it into a gold mine for the profit of contractors, who secure their jobs through wire pulling politicians.

Will The Tribune ask, in the name of the taxpayers, who is responsible for the utter uselessness of the eleven warships now being refitted with entirely new machinery? Why should the citizens of the United States be taxed for the specific purpose of defence when the money thus accumulated is turned over with criminal negligence to incapable or dishonest contractors? Before one cent of any new taxes levied for this purpose is paid out the government should so safeguard the country from incompetence and swindling that the nation shall receive the goods it pays for. As things are now, the army and navy authorities are not to be trusted to disburse public funds.

Why go through the form of building warships fit only for the scrap heap when completed? Why not hand the money over to the contractors in a lump sum and so obviate tedious waiting on their part and a false sense of security and preparedness on the part of the taxpayer?

ONE OF THEM.
Rhinebeck, N. Y., Oct. 19, 1915.

Telephone Enterprise.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: The announcement which appeared in the columns of your paper this morning concerning the achievement of transmitting the voice from the Western to the Eastern Hemisphere marks another triumph for privately owned enterprises. It seems only yesterday when we read of the joining of the Atlantic and Pacific coasts by telephone wire, and before our senses are able to fully absorb the significance of the project, another and other wonder is unostentatiously performed. The achievement of the Bell Telephone Company is more than merely scientific. In my judgment, the world has never seen expressed in any other business enterprise so much ability, foresight, perseverance and continuous endeavor to render ever-improving service as has been shown by the telephone company in its forty years of development in the United States. If ever there has been a true public service corporation it is that company. And the suggestion that such a company should be taken over by the Postoffice is one which should offend the common sense of every telephone subscriber in the United States.

The patience and courtesy of the switchboard operators have passed into a proverb.
JAMES COURLANDER.
Mount Vernon, N. Y., Oct. 22, 1915.

Carranza and the Church.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: President Wilson has recognized Carranza as the leader and right man to govern Mexico. He should have done this long ago, and would have done it except for protests by Roman Catholics, who have said that Carranza persecuted Roman Catholics in Mexico on account of their religion. He never did, but when he raised an insurrection against the government of a country they are arrested and put in jail—no matter what their religion is.

It is absurd to say that Roman Catholics were persecuted on account of their religion. Venustiano Carranza does not belong to any Church or creed, and all sects are treated alike. Keep Church and State apart and Mexico will be all right in a short time.
JOHN HENRY SMITH.
New York, Oct. 20, 1915.

MAN'S THE BLAME

Cats Kill Birds from Hunger, Men for Trade.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: Apropos of your editorial "Indicting the Cat," let me ask, since a nuisance is under discussion, why not go to the bottom of the trouble, the veritable root of the evil—human beings? The first charge against cats is that they kill 5,000,000 birds a year. Why do they? Largely because their owners, men and women, endowed with brains and hearts (!), assume no responsibility for their animals, but turn them out for various reasons.

One goes pious to suffer from every kind of neglect and homelessness, which means much to a cat. Get her living she must, and this is the compulsory beginning of her "tendency to revert to the wild and predatory life" which counts so heavily against her. Cats will kill birds; but if their owners took care of them very few birds would lose their lives by cats.

While mentioning these poor 5,000,000 birds, let us remember the men who murder birds for women to wear because women's whim chooses dead birds perched in petticoats to ribbons. A bonnet trimmed with a braided head, indeed, beneath

gore! A brainless head, indeed, beneath such shelter. Plume hunters are far worse than hungry cats, for pussy cats are far wiser than the man, to get his one cigarette, kills several birds by slow degrees.

An American ornithologist says this kind of killing "is a burning shame, and it would make your heart ache to hear the walls of starving young birds whose parents have been killed."

The "small game," whose destruction also is laid to pussy's sins, must mean squirrels, weasels, etc., and again these same victims of bloodthirsty kitty do verily themselves eat little birds and birds' eggs, too. So they must march along with kitty and the bad men and women, and naughty boys, and talkative sportsmen—think, alas, of those bands of little bobolinks on toast, such little birds just a mouthful!

I have two cats, loved pets of my household, who are regularly fed and cared for. I love birds, am a member of the Audubon Society and have feeding stands and places of refuge for their comfort. During nesting time and more or less all summer my cats are kept in a sheltered paddock. The Animal Society, of which I am secretary, is rushed for days gathering in and disposing of cats during the exit of families leaving country homes.

We find homes for these poor outcasts when it is possible; the others—there were 3,002 last year—we do not sell to vivisectionists. This would be cruelty on cruelty, no, we make death at least comfortable for "those too helpless to protest, too patient to complain."

WILLIAM HOCKMAN.
Red Bank, N. J., Oct. 20, 1915.

No Federalized Militia.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: Mr. O'Ryan's reasons, given in this morning's Tribune, for a "one-man head" for these forty-eight little armies of our country's militia are not good reasons—they are political dodges.

There are many excellent reasons which could be given why any such centralizing of the directive power over our militia should never be permitted. Among these many reasons the most practical is involved in the general lack of actual policing against local serious disturbances when, as everybody knows, state military force becomes more or less directly needed.

Besides this, the proposition to federalize our militia, and thereby make it subject to active service outside of and away from the states of its respective organizations, stands as a proposition directly opposed to what the United States Constitution explicitly directs. This should be enough, for although unconstitutional activities are quite generally practised nowadays by individuals, busily bent on boosting their own brief authority—even the United States President indulging these peculiar activities at his pleasure—still, these appear as a heartening bright prospect, appearing attaching to the women's vote) that may, I dare opine, be fully relied on to prevent great increases of the very devilish usurpations which slick practical politicians so commonly arrogate to themselves.

ALFRED LAURENS BRENNAN.
New York, Oct. 21, 1915.